

Fort Baker Historic Boat Shop Request for Qualifications (RFQ)

L-GOGA014-21

NPS Responses to Questions Submitted by April 26, 2019

May 14, 2019

Q1. The RFQ describes in general terms at page 16 various utility projects serving the Historic Boat Shop that were completed by the GGNRA in a series of projects from 2004-2015. Are there any reports and/or plans that describe in further detail the scope of these projects? If so, will these be made available during the RFQ process? We'd like to understand which utilities are on site and the extent to which they've been brought to the various buildings and other project elements. For example, are there any utilities (electric, water, sewer or other) that presently extend to Historic Boat Shop Guest Dock?

NPS Response R1.

NPS intends to provide additional details on existing utility services as part of the release of any future request for proposals (RFP) following this RFQ. In remarks at the April 16 presubmittal conference, the NPS representative indicated that new or improved utility infrastructure was generally brought by NPS to the main historic boat shop building (Building 679) after the closure of the base, but not to the other small buildings in the complex.

Any existing utilities in the vicinity of the Guest Dock are believed to be "stubs" from the main utility services to Building 679.

NPS is also currently engaged with AT&T to improve telecommunications infrastructure serving Building 679 utilizing underground ductbank constructed by NPS after the closure of the base.

Q2. The RFQ at pages 29 through 31 contains hyperlinks to various Historic Boat Shop RFQ Supporting Documents. Except for those reports, does the NPS have any additional reports on the Historic Boat Shop (Building 679), the Guest Dock and Marine Railway (Building 668), Additional Historic Structures (Buildings 664, 665 and 699), the Marina or any other property that is the subject of the RFQ, including (i) physical property condition, (ii) seismic conditions; (iii) environmental conditions

(including hazardous materials), and (iv) accessibility conditions. If so, will these be made available during the RFQ process?

NPS Response R2.

NPS will not be providing additional information during the RFQ process.

NPS intends to supplement the provided RFQ supporting documents with a relatively small number of additional reports and information sources as part of the release of any future request for proposals (RFP) to invited respondents following this RFQ. These information sources are expected to include: 1) an updated NPS historic structures report for the Historic Boat Shop, Marine Railway, the Additional Historic Structures, and the immediate historic landscape; 2) more detailed “as built” information on the fire sprinkler system and the eastern end of the deck, as both of these building elements were rehabilitated or constructed by NPS as part of formal NPS projects from 2004-2016, and; 3) various Army-era historic building drawings from the Park Archives and other sources. NPS also intends to update the disclosures in the future RFP with any additional relevant reports that may be uncovered during the intervening time period – as of the date of the release of the RFQ, to the actual knowledge of NPS, without investigation or inquiry, there are no known additional reports regarding general building physical, seismic, environmental, and accessibility conditions.

In remarks at the April 16 presubmittal conference, the NPS representative noted that the RFQ was focused on qualifications and not a design exercise for potential RFQ respondents. Following the RFQ, the later RFP response period will include structured time for the invited RFP respondents to access the buildings and site to assist in preparation of the required components of an RFP response.

Q3. The RFQ mentions at page 8 that the NPS anticipates that project costs for building and site will likely exceed \$3 million. Is there any additional information that can be made available during the RFQ process as to how this project cost estimate was arrived at by the NPS and how it was allocated by the NPS among various project components? For example, the RFQ at page 12 references improvements that will need to be made to the Guest Dock and that RFQ respondents should include rehabilitation cost estimates for this project component. Is there any cost information that the NPS has on this portion of the project? It seems to us that it is premature for respondents to provide such detailed cost estimates at this stage, given the detailed physical analysis, economic feasibility calculations, and development programming that would need to occur. Can you explain why this information is being sought at the RFQ stage of the process and what level of detail is expected in this regard?

NPS Response R3.

NPS did not develop a project cost estimate for this RFQ. Rather, NPS indicated on RFQ page 8 that the Premises would require “substantial improvements” that would “likely exceed \$3 million” and could be

“substantially higher” based on many factors. NPS will not be providing additional information during the RFQ process.

In remarks at the April 16 presubmittal conference, the NPS representative noted that the RFQ was focused on qualifications and not a design exercise for potential RFQ respondents. Following the RFQ, the later RFP response period will include structured time for the invited RFP respondents to access the buildings and site to assist in preparation of the required components of an RFP response.

Please refer to RFQ Section D2 Financing Strategy (page 27), which calls for respondents to reply in narrative form, and that “NPS recognizes that precise development budgets are difficult to provide prior to a complete due diligence review...” and that “...greater detail...will be required by NPS during the later RFP stage...”

Q4. Similarly, as an example, the RFQ at page 15 references that The Marina as an Optional Project Element requires rehabilitation or replacement to meet current accessibility, utility service and other regulatory requirements. Does the NPS have any further information of what is required in this regard?

NPS Response R4.

NPS characterization of the marina is based on simple visual observation of conditions and not upon any additional information on the marina and its physical condition, and long-term development and operation of the marina was not included in the approved final environmental impact statement. RFQ respondents interested in operation of a marina can demonstrate familiarity, experience, and qualifications with typical contemporary marina operating requirements, such as accessibility, utility services, or other regulatory requirements as may be applicable, as part of a submitted concept and qualifications, per Evaluation Criteria B1, B2, C,1 and C2 (page 24) and Contents of an RFQ Response Section B1, B2, C1 and C2 (page 26).

Q5. What is the Department of Defense / U.S. Army role in environmental remediation and environmental conditions?

NPS Response R5.

Please refer to RFQ pages 17-18 (“Environmental Conditions”) and the RFQ Supporting Documents in the “Real Estate” and “Environmental Remediation” Document Subject Areas.

In remarks at the April 16 presubmittal conference, the NPS representative noted that the U.S. Department of the Interior executed a memorandum of agreement with the Department of the Army regarding potential continuing Army responsibility for certain conditions as more particularly set forth in the memorandum of agreement. The NPS representative also noted that lead-based paint and lead-based paint in soils were not continuing Army responsibilities under this agreement, and these costs

have been borne by NPS tenants at Fort Baker as tenant development expenses, such as at the Cavallo Point Lodge project.

Q6. What is the best way to keep in touch with NPS during the RFQ process?

NPS Response R6

The best way for potential RFQ respondents to keep current about the status of the RFQ is to check the dedicated NPS RFQ project web site at this web address:

www.nps.gov/goga/getinvolved/fortbakerrfq.htm

Although NPS representatives are collecting email addresses from potential RFQ respondents per the registration request indicated on RFQ Page 21, we are not relying on NPS email as a means of communication with potential respondents about the status of the RFQ.

Q7. Are responses to this RFQ limited to those organizations that responded to the previous NPS request for expressions of interest (“RFEI”) back in 2011-2012?

The RFQ is open to all interested individuals and organizations, per RFQ page 4 (“Open Opportunity”). An RFQ respondent is not required to have responded to the previous RFEI. An RFQ respondent also does not have to attend the April 16 RFQ presubmittal conference.

Q8. NPS published and distributed the Fort Baker plan – where is there a document or similar showing that the plan was approved?

The approval of the park’s Fort Baker plan and the accompanying final environmental impact statement (“FEIS”) is contained in a specific document called a “Record of Decision,” often known by the acronym “ROD.” The Fort Baker ROD is a single PDF download available as part of the 2000 Fort Baker Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision web link listed in the RFQ Supporting Documents.

Note: These NPS responses to submitted questions are subject to the same limitations and provisions contained in the RFQ, including but not limited to the Limitations section contained on pages 34-35 of the RFQ.